

Appl. No. 10/700,131
Atty. Docket No. 9408
Amendment After Final dated June 27, 2006
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 12-14 are withdrawn. Claim 1 and 8 are canceled. Claim 9 is currently amended to add the upper height limit for the protrusions and to remove the Markush group at the end of the claim, the basis of which is in the original claims and specification. Claims 2, 3, and 5-7 are amended to depend from claim 9 instead of claim 1. No new matter has been added.

The rejection of claims 9-11 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is rendered moot since Applicant deleted the Markush group in the last three lines of claim 9.

The 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 1-8, over US 6,461,720, Graff in view of US 6,129,972, McNeil, is also moot in light of the cancellation of claim 1.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102 or Alternatively Under §103 Over U.S. 3,227,598
(herein "Robb") or U.S. 3,525,663 (herein "Hale") or U.S. 4,555,433(herein "Jablonka")

Robb is silent as to the height of the projections. As amended, Applicant's claim 9 specifically limits the dimensions of Applicant's claimed invention in the z-direction to the range of about 300 μm to 5,000 μm . However, the core material taught in Robb would not be of the same dimensions claimed by Applicant's claim 9 because of the unique function that Robb's teaching purports to perform. That is, the invention in Robb is directed toward the core material of building supplies such as "lightweight panels in interior and exterior walls, floors, decks, roofs, and other structural elements." (Robb, col. 1, lines 15-16 et. seq.) Thus, the specific dimensions claimed by the Applicant are not taught in Robb, and therefore are not anticipated by Robb. Furthermore, one of skill in the art would not be motivated by Robb's teaching to use smaller dimensions, since such small dimensions, as claimed by the present invention, would be unsuitable for the functions taught by Robb.

Hale is silent as to the height of the projections. As amended, Applicant's claim 9 specifically limits the dimensions of Applicant's claimed invention in the z-direction to the range of about 300 μm to 5,000 μm . However, the core material taught in Hale would not be of the same dimensions claimed by Applicant's claim 9 because of the unique function that Hale's teaching purports to perform. That is, the invention in Hale is directed toward "structural core of high strength-to-weight characteristic," "an anti-clastic

Appl. No. 10/700,131
Atty. Docket No. 9408
Amendment After Final dated June 27, 2006
Customer No. 27752

membrane possessing superior acoustical properties," and "stable structural insulation [panels]" among other things (Hale, col. 2, lines 21-52, *et seq.*) Thus, the specific dimensions claimed by the Applicant are not taught in Hale, and therefore are not anticipated by Hale. Furthermore, one of skill in the art would not be motivated by Hale's teaching to use smaller dimensions, since such small dimensions as claimed by the present invention would be unsuitable for the functions taught by Hale.

Jablonka is also silent as to the height of the projections. As amended, Applicant's claim 9 specifically limits the dimensions of Applicant's claimed invention in the z-direction to the range of about 300 μm to 5,000 μm . However, Jablonka would not be of the same dimensions claimed by Applicant's claim 1 because of the unique function that Jablonka's teaching purports to perform. That is, the invention in Jablonka is directed toward "a sound-absorbing element ... which may extend over large areas of several square meters" (Jablonka, col. 4, lines 65-68, col. 5, line 1). Thus, the specific dimensions claimed by the Applicant cannot be anticipated by the teachings in Jablonka because such small dimensions would be unsuitable for the functions claimed by Jablonka. Because Jablonka does not teach each and every element recited in the present claims, Jablonka does not anticipate the claims. Furthermore, one of skill in the art would not be motivated by Jablonka's teaching to use smaller projection dimensions, since such small dimensions, as claimed by the present invention, would be unsuitable for the functions taught by Jablonka.

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form for allowance and to adopt Examiner's suggestion. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of Claims 2-7 and 9-11 are respectfully requested.

Rcspcctfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By Betty J. Zea
Betty J. Zea
Registration No. 36,069
(513) 634-5392

June 27, 2006
Customer No. 27752

Page 6 of 6